



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,207	02/20/2004	Jim B. Surjaatmadja	2003-IP-012367U1	6688

7590 04/29/2005

Robert A. Kent
Halliburton Energy Services
2600 South 2nd Street
Duncan, OK 73536-0440

EXAMINER

CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/783,207	Applicant(s) SURJAATMADJA ET AL.	
	Examiner Sharidan Carrillo	Art Unit 1746	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 03/28/2005

13. ☐ Other: _____


SHARIDAN CARRILLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Sharidan Carrillo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1746

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of the claims as being anticipated by Scapanski is withdrawn in view of arguments presented by applicant.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Houghton fails to teach a degradable particle. Houghton teaches inorganic per salt such as sodium perborate. On page 9, Houghton teaches the sodium perborate as an anhydrous solid which is blended with the liquid phase. The limitations of a degradable particle is an inherent characteristic of the composition since Houghton and the instant application are claiming the same composition. Applicant argues that Banerjee fails to teach degradable particles. Applicant argues that Banerjee teaches a high pressure liquid which does not contain any particles. Applicant argues that Banerjee teaches a solid CO₂ particle entrained in a gaseous CO₂ stream. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive since a fluid by definition encompasses both liquid and gases and therefore the claim limitations read on the teachings of the reference. Additionally, col. 3, claim 12 teaches spraying liquid CO₂ and particles simultaneously. Applicant argues that MacVitte fails to teach degradable particles since the liquid must not react or dissolve with suspended particles. Applicant argues that the polycarbonate of MacVitte is not degradable since the liquid must not react or dissolve with the particle. Applicant further states that polycarbonate may be degradable in the appropriate base fluid. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive since applicant is not claiming the specific base fluid. Additionally, one would reasonably expect the particle to degrade as a result of turbulent flow through the conduit during cleaning. Additionally, degradation is not limited to dissolution of particles in water. Degradation can result based on other means, as previously discussed in the specification and the previous Office Action. However, MacVitte does not teach away from degradation of the particle by other means such as impact of the conduit during cleaning and applicant has not limited the definition of degradation of particles to solely include dissolution with water.